A

DISCOURSE

CONCERNING

Tranſubſtantiation

AND

IDOLATRY.

BEING AN

ANSWER

TO THE

BISHOP of *Oxford's* PLEA relating to thoſe two Points.

By Dr Burnet.

London, Printed in the Year, 1688.

An ANSWER *to the* REASONS *of the Bishop of* Oxford, *&c.*

THIS Author would perswade the World, "That *Transubstantiation* is but a Nicety of "the Schools, calculated to the *Aristotelian* "Philosophy; and not defined positively in "the Church of *Rome*; but that the *Corporal* and *Real* "*Presence* of the Substance of Christ's *Body* and *Blood* "in the Sacrament was the Doctrine of the *Universal* "*Church* in the Primitive Times; and that it is at this "day the generally received Doctrine by all the diffe-"rent Parties in *Europe*, not only the *Roman Catholicks* "and *Lutherans*, but both by the Churches of *Switzer-*"*land* and *France*, and more particularly by the "Church of *England*: So that since all that the Church "of *Rome* means by *Transubstantiation*, is the *Real* "*Presence*, and since the *Real Presence* is so universally "received, it is a heinous thing to renounce *Transub-*"*stantiation*; for that is in effect the renouncing the "*Real Presence*.

This is the whole strength of his Argument, which he fortifies by many Citations, to prove that both the Antient *Fathers*, and the Modern *Reformers*, believed the *Real Presence*; and that the Church of *Rome* believes no more. But to all this I shall offer a few Exceptions.

I. If *Tranſubſtantiation* is only a Philoſophical Nicety concerning the *manner* of the *Preſence*, where is the hurt of renouncing it? And why are the *Roman Catholicks* at ſo much Pains to have the *Teſt* repealed? For it contains nothing againſt the *Real Preſence*: Indeed, if this Argument has any force, it ſhould rather lead the *Rom. Catholicks* to take the *Teſt*, ſince, according to the Biſhop, they do not renounce in it any Article of Faith, but only a bold Curioſity of the School-men. Yet after all, it ſeems they know, that this is contrary to their Doctrine, otherwiſe they would not venture ſo much upon a Point of an old and decried Philoſophy.

II. In order to the ſtating this matter aright, it is neceſſary to give the true Notion of the *Real Preſence*, as it is acknowledged by the *Reformed*. We all know in what ſenſe the Church of *Rome* underſtands it, that in the *Sacrament* there is no *Real Bread and Wine*; but that under the appearance of them we have the true Subſtance of *Chriſt*'s glorified Body. On the other hand, the *Reformed*, when they found the World generally fond of this Phraſe; they by the ſame Spirit of Compliance, which our Saviour and his Apoſtles had for the *Jews*, and that the Primitive Church had (perhaps to exceſs) for the *Heathens*, retained the Phraſe of *Real Preſence*: But as they gave it ſuch a ſenſe as did fully demonſtrate, that tho they retained a term that had for it a long Preſcription, yet they quite changed its meaning: For they always ſhewed, that the *Body and Blood of Chriſt*, which they believed preſent, was his *Body broken*, and his *Blood ſhed*, that is to ſay, his *Body*, not in its *glorified State*, but as it was *crucified*. So that the Preſence belonging to Chriſt's

dead

dead Body, which is not now actually in being, is only his *Death* that is to be conceived to be presented to us, and this being the sense that they always give of the *Real Presence*, the *reality* falls only on that conveyance, that is made to us in the Sacrament, by a federal right of *Christ's Death* as our Sacrifice. The Learned Answerer to the *Oxford* Discourses has so fully demonstrated this from the copious Explanations which all the *Reformed* give of that Phrase, that one would think it were not possible either to mistake or cavil in so clear a Point. The *Papists* had generally objected to the *Reformers*, that they made the *Sacrament* no more than a bare Commemoratory Feast; and some few had carried their aversion to that gross *Presence*, which the Church of *Rome* had set up, to another extreme, to which the People by a Principle of Libertinism might have been too easily carried, if the true Dignity of the Sacrament had not been maintained by Expressions of great Majesty: So finding that the World was possessed of the Phrase of the *Real Presence*, they thought fit to preserve it, but with an Explanation that was liable to no Ambiguity. Yet it seems our *Reformers* in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign had found, that the Phrase had more power to carry Men to Superstition, than the Explanations given to it, had to retire them from it, and therefore the Convocation ordered it to be laid aside, tho that Order was suppressed out of Prudence: And the Phrase has been ever since in use among us, of which Dr. *Burnet* has given us a copious account, *Hist. Reform.* 2 vol. 3d Book.

III. The difference between the Notion of the *Sacraments* being a meer Commemoratory Feast, and the *Real Presence*, is as great, as the value of the King's Head

Head ſtamped upon a Meddal differs from the current Coin, or the Impreſſion made by the Great Seal upon Wax differs from that which any Carver or Graver may make. The one is a meer *Memorial*, but the other has a ſacred Badg of Authority in it. The Paſchal Lamb was not only a *Remembrance* of the Deliverance of the People of *Iſrael* out of *Egypt*, but a continuance of the *Covenant*, that *Moſes* made between God and them, which diſtinguiſhed them from all the Nations round about them, as well as the firſt *Paſſover* had diſtinguiſhed them from the *Egyptians*. Now it were a ſtrange Inference, becauſe the *Lamb* was called the *Lord's Paſſover*, that is, the Sacrifice upon the ſprinkling of whoſe Blood the Angel *paſſed over* or *paſſed* by the Houſes of the *Iſraelites*, when he ſmote the firſt-born of the *Egyptians*, to ſay, that there was a change of the Subſtance of the *Lamb*: Or becauſe the Real Faith of a Prince is given by his Geat Seal, printed on Wax, and affixed to a Parchment, that therefore the Subſtance of the Wax is changed: So it is no leſs abſurd to imagine, that becauſe the Bread and Wine are ſaid to be the *Body and Blood of Chriſt* as *broken* and *ſhed*, that is, his Death *really* and effectually offered to us, as our *Sacrifice*, that therefore the Subſtance of the *Bread and Wine* are changed.

And thus upon the whole matter, that which is preſent in the Sacrament is Chriſt *dead*, and ſince his Death was tranſacted above 1600 Years ago, the reality of his Preſence can be no other than a Real Offer of his Death made to us in an Inſtitution and federal Symbol. I have explained this the more fully, becauſe with this all the Ambiguity in the uſe of that commonly received Phraſe falls off.

IV. As

IV. As for the *Doctrine* of the Antient Church, there has been ſo much ſaid in this *Enquiry*, that a Man cannot hope to add any new Diſcoveries to what has been already found out: Therefore I ſhall only endeavour to bring ſome of the moſt Important Obſervations into a narrow compaſs, and to ſet them in a good Light, and ſhall firſt offer ſome general *Preſumptions*, to ſhew that it is not like, that this was the *Doctrine* of the Primitive Times, and then ſome poſitive proof of it.

1. It is no ſlight *Preſumption* againſt it, that we do not find the *Fathers* take any pains to anſwer the Objections that do naturally ariſe out of the preſent Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. Theſe Objections do not ariſe out of profound Study, or great Learning, but from the plain Dictates of common Senſe, which make it hard (to ſay no more) for us to believe, *That a Body can be in more places than one at once; and that it can be in a place after the manner of a Spirit: That Accidents can be without their Subject; or that our Senſes can deceive us in the plaineſt caſes.* We find the *Fathers* explain ſome abſtruſe Difficulties, that ariſe out of other Myſteries, that were leſs known, and were more ſpeculative: And while they are thought perhaps to overdo the one, it is a little ſtrange that they ſhould never touch the other: But on the contrary, when they treat of Philoſophical Matters, they expreſs themſelves roundly in oppoſition to thoſe Conſequences of this Doctrine: Whereas ſince this Doctrine has been received, we ſee all the Speculations of Philoſophy have been ſo managed, as to keep a reſerve for this Doctrine. So that the uncautious way in which the Fathers handled them (in proof of which Volumes of Quotations

tations can be made) ſhews they had not then received that *Doctrine*, which muſt of neceſſity give them occaſion to write otherwiſe than they did.

2. We find the *Heathens* ſtudied to load the *Chriſtian Religion* with all the heavieſt Imputations that they could give it. They objected to them the believing a God that was born, and that died, and the Reſurrection of the Dead, and many leſſer matters, which ſeemed abſurd to them: They had Malice enough to ſeek out every thing that could diſgrace a *Religion* which grew too hard for them: But they never once object this, of *making a God out of a piece of Bread, and then eating him:* If this had been the Doctrine of thoſe Ages, the *Heathens*, chiefly *Celſus* and *Porphiry*, but above all *Julian*, could not have been ignorant of it. Now it does not ſtand with common Senſe to think, that thoſe who inſiſt much upon inconſiderable things, could have paſſed over this, which is both ſo ſenſible, and of ſuch importance, if it had been the received Belief of thoſe Ages.

3. It is alſo of weight, that there were no Diſputes nor Hereſies upon this Point during the firſt Ages; and that none of the *Hereticks* ever objected it to the *Doctors* of the Church. We find they contended about all other Points: Now this hath ſo many Difficulties in it, that it ſhould ſeem a little ſtrange, that all Mens Underſtandings ſhould have been then ſo eaſie and conſenting, that this was the ſingle Point of the whole Body of Divinity, about which the Church had no diſpute for the firſt *ſeven* Centuries. It therefore inclines a Man rather to think, that becauſe there were no Diſputes concerning it, therefore it was not then broached: Since we ſee plainly, that ever ſince it was broached in the *Weſt*, it has occaſioned laſting Diſputes,

Diſputes, both with thoſe who could not be brought to believe it, and with one another concerning the ſeveral ways of explaining and maintaining it.

4. It is alſo a ſtrong *Prejudice* againſt the Antiquity of this Doctrine, that there were none of thoſe Rites in the firſt Ages, which have crept in in the latter; which were ſuch natural Conſequences of it, that the belief of the one making way for the other, we may conclude, that where the one were not practiſed, the other was not believed. I will not mention all the Pomp which the latter Ages have invented to raiſe the luſtre of this *Doctrine*, with which the former Ages were unacquainted. It is enough to obſerve, that the *Adoration* of the Sacrament was ſuch a neceſſary Conſequence of this *Doctrine*, that ſince the Primitive Times knew nothing of it, as the *Greek* Church does not to this day, it is perhaps more than a *Preſumption*, that they believed it not.

V. But now I come to more poſitive and convincing Proofs: And,

1. The Language of the whole Church is only to be found in the *Liturgies*, which are more ſeverely compoſed than Rhetorical Diſcourſes; and of all the parts of the Office, the *Prayer of Conſecration* is that, in which we muſt hope to find moſt certainly the *Doctrine* of the Church: We find then in the fourth *Century*, that in the Prayer of Conſecration the *Elements* were ſaid to be the *Types of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, as St. *Baſil* informs us from the *Greek Liturgies*, and *the Figure of his Body and Blood*, as St. *Ambroſe* informs us from the *Latin Liturgies*: The *Prayer* of *Conſecration*, that is now in the *Canon* of the *Maſs*, is in a great part the ſame with that which is cited by

St. *Ambroſe*, but with this important difference, that inſtead of the words, *which is the Figure of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, that are in the former, there is a Petition added in the latter, that *the Gifts may be to us the* Body and Blood of Chriſt. If we had ſo many of the MSS. of the ancient Liturgies left, as to be able to find out the time in which the *Prayer* of the Conſecration was altered, from what it was in St. *Ambroſe*'s days, to what it is now, this would be no ſmall Article in the *Hiſtory of Tranſubſtantiation:* But moſt of theſe are loſt; ſince then the antient Church could not believe otherwiſe of the Sacrament, than as ſhe expreſſed her ſelf concerning it in the Prayer of Conſecration; it is plain, that her firſt *Doctrine* concerning it was, That the *Bread and Wine were the Types, and the Figure of the Body and Blood of Chriſt.*

2. A ſecond Proof is from the Controverſy, that was began by the *Apollinariſts*, and carried on by the *Eutichians*, Whether Chriſt's Humanity was ſwallowed up of his Divinity or not? The *Eutychians* made uſe of the general Expreſſions, by which the change in the *Sacrament* ſeemed to be carried ſo far, that the Bread and Wine were ſwallowed up by it; and from this they inferred, that in like manner the Human Nature of Chriſt was ſwallowed up by his Divinity: But in oppoſition to all this, we find *Chryſoſtome* the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, *Ephrem* the Patriarch of *Antioch*, *Gelaſius* the Pope, *Theodoret* a Biſhop in *Aſia* the leſs, and *Facundus* in *Africk*, all within the compaſs of little more than an Age, agree almoſt in the ſame words, in refuting all this: aſſerting, *That as the Human Nature in Chriſt remained ſtill the ſame that it was before, notwithſtanding its Union with the Divine Nature; even ſo the Bread and Wine retained ſtill their former* Nature, Subſtance and Form,

Form, and that *they are only ſanctified, not by the change of their* Nature, *but by adding Grace to Nature.* This they do in terms plain, and beyond all exception; and *Theodoret* goes over the matter again and again, in two different Treatiſes; ſo that no Matter of Fact can appear more plainly, than that the whole Church *Eaſt*, and *Weſt*, and *South*, did in the *5th* and *6th Centuries* believe, that the Sanctification of the *Elements* in the Sacrament did no more deſtroy their Natures, than the Union of the two Natures in Chriſt did deſtroy his Humane Nature.

3. A third Proof is taken from a Practice, which I will not offer to juſtify, how ancient ſoever it may have been: It appears indeed in the ancienteſt *Liturgies* now extant, and is a *Prayer*, in which the *Sacrament* is ſaid to be offered up in *Honour of the Saint of the Day*, to which a Petition is added, that it may be *accepted of God by the Interceſſion of the Saint.* This is yet in the *Miſſal*, and is uſed upon moſt of the Saints days: Now if the Sacrament was then believed to be the *very Body and Blood of Chriſt*, there is nothing more *crude*, not to ſay *Prophane*, than to offer this up to the *Honour of a Saint*, and and to pray that the Sacrifice of *Chriſt*'s Body may be accepted of God thrô the Interceſſion of a *Saint*. Therefore to give any tolerable Senſe to theſe words, we muſt conclude, That tho theſe Prayers have been continued in the *Roman* Church, ſince this Opinion prevailed; yet they were never made in an Age in which it was received. The only meaning that can be given to theſe words is, that they made the *Saints-days* days of Communion, as well as the *Sundays* were; and upon that they prayed, that the Sacrament which they received that day, to do the more Honour to the Memory of the Saint, might be recommended to the

Divine Acceptance by the Interceſſion of the Saint: So that this ſuperſtitious Practice ſhews plainly, That the *Church* had not, even when it began, received the *Doctrine* of the change of the Elements into the Body and Blood of Chriſt.

I will not purſue the Proof of this Point farther, nor will I enter into a particular recital of the Sayings of the *Fathers* upon this Subject; which would carry me far: And it is done ſo copiouſly by others, that I had rather refer my Reader to them, than offer him a lean Abridgment of their Labours.

I ſhall only add, That the *Preſumptions* and Proofs that I have offered, are much more to be valued, than the pious and Rhetorical Figures, by which many of the *Fathers* have ſet forth the manner of Chriſt's *Preſence* in the Sacrament. One thing is plain, that in moſt of them they repreſent Chriſt preſent in his dead and crucified State, which appears moſt eminently in St. *Chryſoſtome*; ſo that this agrees with that Notion of a *Real Preſence*, that was formerly explained. Men that have at the ſame time all the heat in their Imaginations that Eloquence can raiſe, and all the fervour in their Heart which Devotion can inſpire, are ſeldom ſo correct in their Phraſes and Figures, as not to need ſome allowances: Therefore one plain Proof of their Opinions from their reaſonings, when in cold Blood, ought to be of much more weight than all their Tranſports and Amplifications.

From this general view of the State of the *Church* during the firſt *Centuries*, I come next to conſider the ſteps of the Change which was afterwards made. I will not offer to trace out that Hiſtory, which Mr. *Larrogue* has done copiouſly, whom I the rather mention, becauſe he is put in *Engliſh*. I ſhall only obſerve,

ſerve, that by reaſon of the high Expreſſions, which were uſed upon the occaſion of the *Eutychian* Controverſy formerly mentioned, by which the Sanctification of the *Elements* was compared to the Union of the Humane Nature of Chriſt with his Divinity, a great ſtep was made to all that followed. During the Diſpute concerning *Images*, thoſe who oppoſed the Worſhip of them, ſaid, according to all the ancient Liturgies, that they indeed acknowleged one *Image* of Chriſt, which was the *Sacrament*; thoſe who promoted that piece of Superſtition (for I refer the calling it *Idolatry* to its proper place) had the Impudence to deny, that it had ever been called the *Image of Chriſt's Body and Blood*; and ſaid, that it was *really* his *Body and Blood*. We will not much diſpute concerning an Age, in which the World ſeemed mad with a Zeal for the Worſhip of *Images*; and in which *Rebellion*, and the depoſing of *Princes*, upon the pretence of Hereſy, began to be put in practice: Such Times as theſe we willingly yeild up to our Adverſaries. Yet *Damaſcene*, and the *Greek* Church after him, carried this matter no farther than to aſſert an Aſſumption of the *Elements* into an Union with the *Body and Blood of Chriſt*. But when the Monk of *Corbie* began to carry the matter yet farther, and to ſay, that the *Elements* were changed into that *very Body of Chriſt that was born of the Virgin*, we find all the great Men of that Age, both in *France*, *Germany* and *England*, writ againſt him: And he himſelf owns that he was looked upon as an Innovator; thoſe who writ againſt him, chiefly *Rabanus Maurus*, and *Bertram* or *Ratramne*, did ſo plainly aſſert the ancient Opinion of the Sacraments being the *Figure of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, that we cannot expreſs our ſelves more formally than they did: And

from

from thence it was, that our *Saxon* Homily on *Easter*-Day was so expres in this point. Yet the War and the *Northern* Invasions that followed, put the World into so much disorder, that all Disputes were soon forgot, and that in the *11th Century* this Opinion, which had so many Partisans in the *9th*, was generally decried and much abandoned.

VI. But with relation to those Ages in which it was received, some Observations occur so readily to every one that knows History, that it is only for the sake of the more ignorant that I make them.

1. They were Times of so much Ignorance, that it is scarce conceivable to any but to those who have laboured a little in reading the Productions of those Ages, which is the driest Piece of Study I know: The Stile in which they writ, and their way of arguing, and explaining Scripture, are all of a piece, both Matter and Form are equally barbarous. Now in such Times, as the ignorant *Populace* were easily misled, so there is somewhat in incredible Stories and Opinions, that makes them pass as easily, as Men are apt to fancy they see Sprights in the Night: Nay the more of Mystery and Darkness that there is in any Opinion, such Times are apt to cherish it the more for that very reason.

2. Those were Ages in which the whole Ecclesiastical *Order* had entred into such Conspiracies against the *State*, which were managed and set on with such vigor by the *Popes*, that every Opinion which tended to render the Persons of Church-men *sacred*, and to raise their Character, was likely to receive the best Entertainment, and the greatest Incouragement possible. Nothing could so secure the Persons of *Priests*, and render them so considerable, as to believe *that they made their*

their God: And in such Ages no Armour was of so sure a Proof, as for a Priest to take his God in his Hands.

Now it is known that P. *Gregory* the *7th*, who condemned *Berengarius*, laid the Foundations of the Ecclesiastical Empire, by establishing the Deposing Power; so P. *Innocent* the *3d*, who got *Transubstantiation* to be decreed, in the *4th* Council of the *Lateran*, seemed to have compleated the Project, by the Addition made to the Deposing Power, of transferring the Dominions of the Deposed *Prince* to whom he pleased; since before this the Dominions must have gone to the next Heirs of the Deposed Prince. It is then so plain, that the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* was so suitable to the advancing of those ends, that it had been a Wonder indeed, if it being once set on foot, had not been established in such times.

3. Those Ages were so corrupt, and more particularly the Clergy, and chiefly the *Popes* were by the confession of all Writers so excessively vicious, that such Men could have no regard to Truth in any of their Decisions. Interest must have carried all other things before it with such *Popes*, who according to the Historians of their own Communion, were perhaps the worst Men that ever lived. Their Vices were so crying, that nothing but the Credit that is due to Writers of their own Time, and their own Church, could determine us to believe them.

4. As the Ignorance and Vices of those Times derogate justly from all the Credit that is due to them; so the Cruelty which followed their Decisions, and which was employed in the Execution of them, makes it appear rather a stranger thing that so many opposed them, than that so many submitted to them. When *Inquisitors* or *Dragoons* manage an Argument, how *strong soever*

the

the Spirit may be in oppoſing, it is certain the *Fleſh will be weak*, and will ply eaſily. When *Princes* were threatned with Depoſition, and *Hereticks* with Extirpation, and when both were executed with ſo much rigour, the Succeſs of all the Doctrines that were eſtabliſhed in thoſe Days ought to make no Impreſſion on us, in its Favour.

VII. It is no leſs plain, that there was a great and vigorous Oppoſition made to every Step of the Progreſs of this Doctrine. When the *Eutychians* firſt made uſe of it, the greateſt Men of that Age ſet themſelves againſt it. When the Worſhippers of *Images* did afterwards deny, that the *Sacrament* was the *Image of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, a General *Council* in the *Eaſt* aſſerted, according to the ancient *Liturgies*, the contrary *Propoſition*. When *Paſchaſe Radbert* ſet on foot the *Corporal Preſence* in the *Weſt*, all the great Men of the Age writ againſt him. *Berenger* was likewiſe highly eſteemed, and had many ſecret Followers, when this Doctrine was firſt decreed: And ever ſince the time of the *Council* of the *Lateran*, that Tranſubſtantiation was eſtabliſhed, there have been whole Bodies of Men that have oppoſed it, and that have fallen as Sacrifices to the Rage of the Inquiſitors. And by the Proceſſes of thoſe of *Tholouſe*, of which I have ſeen the Original *Records*, for the ſpace of twenty Years, it appears, that as Tranſubſtantiation was the Article upon which they were always chiefly examined; ſo it was that which many of them did conſtantly deny, ſo far were they on both ſides from looking on it only as an Explanation of the *Real Preſence*.

VIII. The Novelty of this *Doctrine* appears plainly by the ſtrange work that the *Schools* have made with it, ſince

ſince they got it among them, both in their Philoſophy and Divinity, and by the many different Methods that they took for explaining it, till they had licked it into the ſhape, in which it is now: Which is as plain an Evidence of the Novelty of the Doctrine as can be imagined. The Learned Mr. *Alix* has given us a clear Deduction of all that Confuſion, into which it has caſt the *School-men*, and the many various Methods that they fell on for maintaining it. *Firſt*, They thought the Body of Chriſt was broken by the Teeth of the Faithful: Then that appearing abſurd, and ſubjecting our Saviour to new Sufferings, the Doctrine of a Body's being in a place after the manner of a Spirit was ſet up. And as to the Change, ſome thought that the Matter of Bread remained, but that it was united to the Body of Chriſt, as Nouriſhment is digeſted into our Bodies: Others thought, that the *Form* of Bread remained, the *Matter* only being changed: And ſome thought, that the *Bread* was only withdrawn to give place to the *Body* of Chriſt, whereas others thought it was annihilated. While the better Judges had always an Eye either to a *Conſubſtantiation*, or to ſuch an Aſſumption of the Bread and Wine by the Eternal Word, as made the Sacrament in ſome ſenſe his *Body* indeed; but not that Body which is now in Heaven. All theſe different Opinions, in which the *School-men* were divided, even after the Deciſion made by Pope *Innocent*, in the Council of the *Lateran*, ſhew, that the *Doctrine*, being a Novelty, Men did not yet know how to mould or form it: But in proceſs of Time the whole Philoſophy was ſo digeſted, as to prepare all *Scholars* in their firſt Formation to receive it the more eaſily. And in our Age, in which that Philoſophy has loſt its Credit, what Pains do they take to ſuppreſs the *New* Philoſo-

phy, as seeing that it cannot be so easily subdued to support this Doctrine, as the *Old* one was? And it is no unpleasant thing to see the shifts, to which the Partisans of the *Cartesian* Philosophy are driven, to explain themselves: Which are indeed so very ridiculous, that one can hardly think, that those who make use of them, believe them; for they are plainly rather Tricks and Excuses than Answers.

IX. No Man can deny, that *Transubstantiation* is the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*; but he that will dispute the Authority of the Councils of the *Lateran* and *Trent*. Now tho some have done the first avowedly, yet as their Number is small, and their Opinion decried; so for the Council of *Trent*, tho I have known some of that Communion, who do not look upon it as a *General Council*, and tho it is not at all received in *France*, neither as to Doctrine nor Discipline, yet the contrary Opinion is so universally received, that they who think otherwise, dare not speak out; and so give their Opinion as a Secret, which they trust in Confidence, rather than as a Doctrine which they will own. But setting aside the Authority of these Councils, the common Resolution of Faith in the Church of *Rome* being *Tradition*, it cannot be denied, that the constant and general Tradition in the Church of *Rome*, these last 500 Years, has been in favour of *Transubstantiation*, and that is witnessed by all the Evidences by which it is possible to know *Tradition*. The Writings of Learned Men, the Sermons of Preachers, the Proceedings of Tribunals, the Decisions of Councils, that, if they were not *General*, were yet very numerous, and above all by the many Authentical Declarations the *Popes* have made in this matter. So that either *Tradition* is to be for

for ever rejected as a false Conveyance, or this is the received *Doctrine* of the Church of *Rome*, from which she can never depart, without giving up both her *Infallibility*, and the Authority of *Tradition*.

X. There is not any one Point, in which all the *Reformed Churches* do more unanimously agree, than in the rejecting of *Transubstantiation*; as appears both by the Harmony of their Confessions, and by the current of all the Reformed Writers. And for the *Real Presence*, tho the *Lutherans* explain it by a *Consubstantiation*, and the rest of the *Reformed* by a Reality of Vertue and Efficacy, and a Presence of Christ as crucified; yet all of them have taken much Pains to shew, that in what sense soever they meant it, they were still far enough from *Transubstantiation*. This demonstrates the Wisdom of our *Legislators*, in singling out this to be the sole Point of the *Test* for Imployments: Since it is perhaps the only Point in Controversy, in which the whole Church of *Rome* holds the Affirmative, and the whole *Reformed* hold the Negative. And it is as certain, that *Transubstantiation* is the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, as that it is rejected by the Church of *England*; it being by Name condemned in our *Articles*.

And thus, I hope, the whole Plea of our Author in favour of *Transubstantiation* is overthrown in all its three Branches: which relate to the Doctrine of the *Primitive Church*, the Doctrine of the *Church* of *Rome*, and the Doctrine of the *Church* of *England*, as well as of the other *Reformed Churches*. I have not loaded this Paper with Quotations, because I intended to be short: But I am ready to make good all the matters of Fact

Fact asſerted in it, under the higheſt Pains of Infamy, if I fail in the performance: And beſides, the more Voluminous Works that have been writ on this Subject, ſuch as *Albertines*, *Claudes* Anſwer to Mr. *Arnaud*, and F. *Nonet*, *Larrogues* Hiſtory of the *Euchariſt*, there have been ſo many learned Diſcourſes written of late on this Subject, and in particular, two Anſwers to the Biſhops *Books*, that if it had not been thought expedient, that I ſhould have caſt the whole matter into a ſhort Paper, I ſhould not have judged it neceſſary to trouble the World with more Diſcourſes on a Subject that ſeems exhauſted. I will add no more, but that by the next I will give another Paper of the ſame Bulk upon the *Idolatry of the Church of* Rome.

A N

AN
ANSVVER
To that Part about
IDOLATRY, &c.

THE words of the *Teſt* that belong to this Point are theſe, *The Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin* Mary, *or any other Saint, and the Sacriſice of the Maſs, as they are now uſed in the Church of* Rome, *are ſuperſtitious and idolatrous*; upon which our Author faſtens this Cenſure, "That ſince by this the Church of *Rome* is charged with *Ido-*
" *latry*, which both forfeits Mens Lives here, and their Salva-
" tion hereafter, according to the expreſs words of Scripture:
" It's a damnable peice of Cruelty and Uncharitableneſs, to
" load them with this Charge, if they are not guilty of it; and
" upon this he goes to clear them of it not only in the two Ar-
" ticles mentioned in the *Teſt*, the Worſhip of *Saints*, and the
" Sacrifice of the *Maſs*, but that his Apology might be com-
" pleat, he takes in, and indeed inſiſts chiefly on the Worſhip
" of *Images*, tho, that is not at all mentioned in the *Teſt*, he
" brings a great many Quotations out of the Old Teſtament,
" to ſhew the Idolatry prohibited in it, was the worſhipping
" the Sun, Moon, and Stars, or the making an Image to reſem-
" ble the Divine Eſſence, upon which he produces alſo ſome
" other Authorities. And in this conſiſts the Subſtance of his Plea for the Church of *Rome*. But upon all this he ought to have retracted both the Licenſe that himſelf gave ſome Years ago to Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Book, of the *Idolatry of the Church of Rome*, and his own haſty Aſſertion in condemning both *Turk* and *Papiſt* as guilty of Idolatry; the one *for worſhipping a lewd Impoſtor*, (*Def. of his Eccl. Pol.* p. 285, 286.)

poſtor, and the other for worſhipping a ſenſleſs piece of matter. It ſeems he is now convinced, that the latter part of this Charge that falls on the *Papiſts*, was as falſe as the former that falls on the *Turks* certainly is; for they never worſhipped *Mahomet*, but hold him only in high Reverence, as an extraordinary Prophet, as the *Jews* do *Moſes*. It's very like that if the *Turks* had taken *Vienna*, he would have retracted that, as he has now in effect done the other: for I believe he is in the ſame diſpoſition to reconcile himſelf to the *Mufti*, and the *Pope*, but the Ottoman Empire is now as low as Popery is high: ſo he will brave the *Turk* ſtill to his Teeth, tho he did him wrong, and will humble himſelf to the Papiſt, tho he did him nothing but right: But now I take leave of the Man, and will confine my ſelf ſeverely to the matter that is before me. And,

1. How guilty ſoever the Church of *Rome* is of *Idolatry*, yet the *Teſt* does not plainly aſſert that; for there is as great a difference between *Idolatrous* and *Idolatry*, as there is in Law between what is *treaſonable* and what is *Treaſon*. The one imports only a Worſhip that is conformable to *Idolatry*, and that has a tendency to it, whereas the other is the plain Sin it ſelf. There is alſo a great difference between what *is now us'd in that Church*, and the Explanations that ſome of their Doctors give of that uſage. We are to take the uſage of the *Church* of *Rome* from her Publick Offices, and her authoriſed Practices; ſo that if theſe have a Conformity to *Idolatry*, and a tendency tō it, then the words of the *Teſt* are juſtified, what Senſe ſoever ſome learned Men among them may put on theſe Offices and Practices; therefore the *Teſt* may be well maintained, even tho we ſhould acknowledg that the Church of *Rome* was not guilty of *Idolatry*.

2. If *Idolatry* was a Crime puniſhable by *Death* under the *Old Teſtament*, that does not at all concern us: nor does the Charge of *Idolatry* authorize the People to kill all *Idolaters*; unleſs our Author can prove, that we believe our ſelves to be under all the Political and Judiciary Precepts of the Law of *Moſes*; and even among the Jews the Execution of that ſevere Law belonged either to the Magiſtrate, or to ſome authorized and inſpired Perſon, who as a *Zealot* might execute the Law, when the Magiſtrate was wanting to his Duty; ſo that this was writ invidiouſly only, as it ſeems, to inflame the *Papiſt* the more

againſt

againſt us. But the ſame *Calviniſt Prince*, that has expreſt ſo juſt an Averſion to the repealing the *Teſt*, has at the ſame time ſhewed ſo merciful an Inclination towards the *Ro. Catholicks*, that of all the Reproaches in the World, one that intended to plead for that Religion ought to have avoided the mentioning of Blood or Cruelty with the greateſt care.

3. It's true we cannot help believing that *Idolatry* is a damnable Sin, that ſhuts Men out of the Kingdom of Heaven; and if every Sin in which a Man dies without Repentance does it, much more this, which is one of the greateſt of all Sins. But yet after all, there is Mercy for Sins of Ignorance upon Mens general Repentance; and therefore ſince God alone knows the degrees of Mens Knowledg and of their Ignorance, and how far it is either *affected* on the one hand, and *invincible* on the other, we do not take upon us to enter into God's Secrets, or to judg of the Salvation or Damnation of particular Perſons, nor muſt we be byaſſed in our Enquiry into the nature of any Sin, either by a fond regard to the ſtate of our Anceſtors, or by the due reſpect that we owe to thoſe who are over us in Civil Matters. In this caſe things are what God has declared them to be; we can neither make them better nor worſe than he has made them; and we are only to judg of things, leaving Perſons to the merciful as well as the juſt and dreadful Judgment of God.

4. All the ſtir that our Author keeps with the examining of the *Idolatry* committed by the *Jews* under the *Old Teſtament*, ſuppoſing it were all true, will ſerve no more for acquitting the Church of *Rome*, than a Plea would avail a Criminal, who were arraigned of High Treaſon for coyning Mony, or for counterfeiting the King's Seal, in which one ſhould ſet forth, that *High Treaſon* was the *murdering the King, or the levying War againſt him*, and that therefore the Criminal who was guilty of neither of theſe two, ought to be acquitted. *Idolatry*, as well as Treaſon, is a comprehenſive Notion, and has many different Branches: ſo that tho the worſhipping the Hoſt of Heaven, or the worſhipping an Image as a Reſemblance of the Divinity, may be acknowledged to be the higheſt degrees of *Idolatry*, yet many other Corruptions in the Worſhip of God are juſtly reducible to it, and may be termed not only *idolatrous*, but *Idolatry* it ſelf.

5. Our Saviour in his Sermon on the Mount has ſhewed us how many Sins are reducible to the ſecond Table of the Law, beſides thoſe of *Murder*, *Adultery*, &c. that are expreſly named in it; and tho the Jews in that time having delivered themſelves entirely from the Sin of *Idolatry*, to which their Fathers were ſo prone, gave him no occaſion of commenting on the firſt and ſecond Commandment, yet by the parity of things we may conclude, that many Sins are reducible to them, beſides thoſe that are expreſly named; and tho we have not ſo compleat a Hiſtory of the *Idolatry* of the Neighbouring Nations to *Judea* before the Captivity, yet we do certainly know what was the *Idolatry* of which the *Greeks* and *Romans* were guilty when the New Teſtament was writ, and the greateſt part of the New Teſtament is written chiefly with relation to the Jews, whoſe freedom from *Idolatry* gave no occaſion to treat of it, yet in thoſe few Paſſages which relate to the Heathen *Idolatry* then on foot, the holy Writers retain the ſame Phraſe and Style, that were uſed in the Old Teſtament, which gives us juſt reaſon to believe, that the *Idolatry* was upon the matter and in its main ſtroak the ſame under both, and if ſo, then we have a Door opened to us to diſcover all our Author's falſe reaſonings; and upon this diſcovery we ſhall find that all the inſpired Writers charged the Heathen Worſhip with *Idolatry*, not ſo much with relation to the Gloſſes that Philoſophers and other Political Men might put on their *Rites*, but with relation to the Practice in it ſelf.

6. But ſince *Idolatry* is a Sin againſt a moral and unchangeable Law, let us ſtate the true Notion of the right Worſhip of God, and by conſequence of *Idolatry* (tho this is done with that exactneſs by the worthy *Maſter of the Temple*, that it ſhould make a Man afraid to come after him.) Our Ideas of God, and the Homage of Worſhip and Service that we offer up purſuant to theſe, are not only to be conſidered as they are juſt thoughts of God, and Acts ſuitable to thoſe thoughts, but as they are Ideas that tend both to elevate and purifie our own Natures; for the Thoughts of God are the Seeds of all Truth and Vertue in us, which being deeply rooted in us, makes us become *conformable to the Divine Nature*. So that the Sin of *Idolatry* conſiſts in this, that our Ideas of God being corrupted, he is either defrauded of that Honour, which, tho due to him, is transferred to another, or is diſhonoured by a Worſhip unſutable to his Nature,

Nature, and we alſo by forming wrong Ideas of the Object of our Worſhip, become corrupted by them. Nothing raiſes the Soul of Man more than ſublime Thoughts of God's Greatneſs and Glory; and nothing perfects it more than juſt notions of his Wiſdom and Goodneſs. On the contrary, nothing debaſes our Natures more, than the offering our Worſhip and Service to a Being that is low and unworthy of it; or the depreſſing the Supreme Being in our Thoughts or Worſhip to ſomewhat that is like our ſelves, or perhaps worſe; therefore the deſign of true Religion being the forming in us ſuch notions as may exalt and ſanctify our Natures, as well as the raiſing a Tribute to the Author of our Being, that is in ſome ſort unworthy of him, the Sin of Idolatry is upon this account chiefly forbidden in Scripture, becauſe it corrupts our *Ideas* of God, and by a natural tendency this muſt likewiſe corrupt our Natures, when we either raiſe up an *Idol* ſo far in our Thoughts as to fancy it a *God*, or depreſs *God* ſo far as to make him an *Idol*, for theſe two ſpecies of *Idolatry* have both the ſame effect on us: and as a Wound in a Man's Vitals is much more deſtructive, than any, how deep and dangerous ſoever, that is in his Limbs, ſince it is poſſible for him to recover of the one, but not of the other; ſo *Idolatry* corrupts Religion in its ſource: Thus *Idolatry* in its moral and unchangeable Nature is the honouring any Creature as a God, or the imagining that God is ſuch a Being as the other Creatures are; and this had been a Sin, tho no Law againſt it had ever been given to Mankind but the Light and Law of Nature.

7. But after all this there are different degrees in this Sin: for the true notion of God being this, that he comprehends all Perfections in his Eſſence; the aſcribing all theſe to a Creature, is the higheſt degree of *Idolatry*: but the aſcribing any one of theſe infinite Perfections, or (which is all one with relation to our Actions) the doing any thing which *imports*, or is underſtood to *import* it, is likewiſe *Idolatry*, tho of a lower degree of Guilt; ſo likewiſe the imagining that the true God is no other than as an Idol, repreſents him to be, is the higheſt degree of the other ſpecies of *Idolatry*, but the conceiving him as having a Body in which his Eternal Mind dwells, or fancying that any ſtrange Virtue from him dwells in any Body to ſuch a degree, as to make that Body the proper Object of Worſhip, unleſs he has aſſured

us that he is really united to that Body, and dwells in it; which was the case of the Cloud of Glory under the Old Testament, and much more of the humane Nature of Christ under the New; this is likewise *Idolatry*, for in all these it is plain that the true Ideas of God, and the Principles of Religion are corrupted.

8. There are two Principles in the Nature of Man that make him very apt to fall into *Idolatry*, either inward or outward. The first is the weakness of most Peoples Minds, which are so sunk into gross Phantasms and sensible Objects, that they are scarce capable to raise their Thoughts to pure and spiritual Ideas: and therefore they are apt either to forget Religion quite, or to entertain it by Objects that are visible and sensible: the other is, that Mens Appetites and Passions being for the most part too strong for them, and these not being reconcileable to the true Ideas of a pure and spiritual Essence, they are easily dispos'd to embrace such notions of God as may live more peaceably with their Vices; and so they hope by a Profusion of Expence and Honour, or of Fury and Rage, which they employ in the Worship of an imaginary Deity, to purchase their Pardons, and to compensate for their other Crimes, if not to authorise them. These two Principles that are so rooted in our frail and corrupt Natures, being wrought on by the Craft and Authority of ambitious and covetous Men, who are never wanting in all Ages and Nations, have brought forth all that *Idolatry*, that has appear'd in so many different Shapes up and down the World, and has been diversified according to the various Tempers, Accidents and Constitutions of the several Nations and Ages of the World.

9. I now come to examine the Beginnings of *Idolatry* as they are represented to us in the Scripture, in which it will appear, that our Author's account of it shews him guilty, either of great Ignorance or of that which is worse: he pretends, "that the "first plain Intimation that we have of it in *Palestine*, is, when "*Jacob* after his Conversation with the *Schechemites*, command-"ed his Family to put away their strange Gods; whereas we have an earlier and more particular account of those strange Gods in the same Book of *Genesis*, Chap. 31. where when *Jacob* fled away from *Laban*, it is said, *ver.* 19. that *Rachel* stole her Father's *Images* or *Teraphim*: and these are afterwards call'd by *Laban* his Gods, *ver.* 30. and these very Images are called by *Joshua* 24. *v.* 2. Strange Gods: so that the strange Gods from which

which *Jacob* cleanſed his Family, *Gen.* 35. 2. were no other than the *Teraphim*; ſo that in the *Teraphim* we are to ſeek for the true Original of *Idolatry*, and for the ſenſe of the Phraſe of other Gods, or ſtrange Gods, which is indeed the true Key to this whole matter. Theſe were little Statues, ſuch as the *Dii laris* or *Penates* were afterwards among the *Romans*, or the *Pagods* now in the *Eaſt*, in which it was believed, that there was ſuch a Divine Virtue ſhut up, that the *Idolaters* expected Protection from them: and as all People in all times are apt to truſt to Charms, ſo thoſe who pretended to chain down the Divine Influences to thoſe Images, had here a great occaſion given them to deceive the World; of this ſort was the *Palladium* of *Troy*, and the *Ancille* of *Rome*; and this gave the riſe to all the Cheats of *Toleſmes* and *Taliſmans* that came afterwards, theſe were of different Figures: and ſince our Author confeſſes, *p.* 124. that Cherubim and Teraphim are ſometimes uſed promiſcuouſly for one another, it is probable that the Figure of both was the ſame; and ſince it is plain from *Ezekiel* that the *Cherubim* reſembled a Calf (compare *Ezek.* 1. 10. with *chap.* 10. 14. where what is called in the firſt the Face of an Ox, is called in the other the Face of a Cherub) from hence it is probable that the *Teraphim*, or at leaſt ſome of them were of the ſame Figure. In theſe it was alſo believed, that there were different degrees of Charms: Some were believed ſtronger than others; ſo that probably *Pharaoh* thought that *Moſes* and *Aaron* had a *Teraphim* of greater Virtue than his *Magicians* had, which is the cleareſt account that I know of his hardening his Heart againſt ſo many Miracles: and this alſo ſeems to be the firſt occaſion of the Phraſe of the *Gods of the ſeveral Nations*, and of ſome being ſtronger than other; that is, the *Teraphim* of the one were believed to have a higher degree of Enchantment in them, than the others had.

This then leads us to the right Notion of *Aaron*'s *Golden Calf*, and of the terms of *graved* and *carved Images* in the ſecond Commandment, and even of the *other Gods* in the firſt Commandment: for we have ſeen that both in the ſtile of *Moſes* and *Joſhua* the *Images* were thoſe *Teraphim*, which they alſo called *ſtrange Gods*, when the *Iſraelites* thought that *Moſes* had forſaken them, they came to *Aaron* deſiring him to make them *Gods*, that is, *Teraphims*, yet they preſcribed no form to him, but left that wholly to him, and ſo the Dream of their Fondneſs of the *Egyp-*

tian

tian Idolatry vaniſhes; for it was *Aaron*'s choice that made it a Calf: perhaps he had ſeen the Divine Glory, as a Cloud between the *Cherubims* when he went up into the Mountain; *Exod.* 24. 9, 10. for a *Pattern* being ſhewed to *Moſes* of the Tabernacle that he was to make, it is probable *Aaron* ſaw that likewiſe, and this might diſpoſe him to give them a *Seraphim*, in that figure: this is alſo the moſt probable account both of the Calves of *Dan* and *Bethel* ſet up by *Jeroboam*, and alſo of the *Iſraelites* worſhipping the *Ephod* that *Gideon* made. *Jud.* 8. 27. of the *Idolatry* of *Micah* and the *Danites* who robbed him, *Jud.* 17. 18. and of the *Iſraelites* offering Incenſe to the Brazen Serpent, 2 *Kings* 18. 4. which ſeemed to have all the Solemnities of a *Teraphim* in it, ſo that it is plain, the greateſt part of the *Idolatry* under the *Old Teſtament* was the Worſhip of the *Teraphim*.

10. But to compleat this Argument with relation to the preſent Point, it is no leſs plain, that the true Jehovah was worſhipped in thoſe *Teraphim*. To begin with the firſt, it is clear that *Laban* in the Covenant he made with *Jacob*, appeals not only to the *God of Abraham*, Gen. 31. 53. but likewiſe to *Jehovah*, ver. 49. for though that Name was not then known, yet *Moſes* by uſing it on that occaſion, ſhews us plainly that *Laban* was a Worſhipper of the true God; *Aaron* ſhews the ſame by intimating that Feaſt which he appointed to *Jehovah*, Exod. 32. 5. (which our Author thought not fit to mention) the People alſo by calling theſe, *ver.* 4. the *Gods that brought them out of Egypt*, ſhew that they had no Thoughts of the *Egyptian Idolatry*: but they believed that *Moſes* had carried away the *Teraphim*, in the Virtue of which it ſeems they fancied that he had wrought his Miracles, and that *Aaron*, who they believed knew the Secret, had made them new ones: and this is the moſt probable account of their Joy in celebrating that Feaſt. And as for *Jeroboam*, the caſe ſeems to be plainly the ſame; he made the People believe that the *Teraphim* which he gave them in *Dan* and *Bethel*, were as good as thoſe that were at *Jeruſalem*: for as his deſign was no other than to hinder their going thither, 1 *Kings* 12. 27. ſo it is not likely that either he would or durſt venture upon a total Change of their Religion, or that it could have paſſed ſo eaſily with the People, whereas the other had nothing extraordinary in it. It is alſo plain, that as *Jeroboam* called the Calves the *Gods that brought them out of* Egypt, *v.* 28. ſo he ſtill acknow-

acknowledged the true *Jehovah*: for the Prophets both true and falſe in his Time propheſied in the Name of *Jehovah*, 1 *King*. 13. 2, 18, 26. and when his Son was ſick, he ſent his Wife to the Prophet of *Jehovah*, ch. 14. The Story of the new *Idolatry*, that *Achab* ſet up of the *Baalim*, ſhews alſo plainly that the old Worſhippers of the Calves adhered to the true *Jehovah*: for *Elijah* ſtates the matter, as if the Nation had been divided between *Jehovah* and *Baal*, 1 King. 18. 21, 39. And the whole Story of *Jehu* confirms this, 2 *Kings* 9. 6, 12, 36. he was anointed *King* in the Name of *Jehovah*: and alſoon as the Captains that were with him, knew this, they acknowledged him their King; he likewiſe ſpeaking of the Fact of the Men of *Samaria*, cites the Authority of *Jehovah*, 2 Kings 10. 10, 16, 29. which ſhews that the People acknowledged it ſtill: and he called his Zeal againſt the Worſhip of *Baal*, his Zeal for *Jehovah*, and yet both he and his Party worſhipped the *Calves*. It is no leſs clear that *Micah*, who called his *Teraphim his Gods*, Judg. 18. 24. was a Worſhipper of the true *Jehovah*, Judg. 17. 13. and there is little reaſon to doubt that this was the caſe of *Gideon*'s Ephod, and of the Brazen Serpent. It were needleſs to go about the proving that all theſe corrupt Ways of Worſhip were *Idolatrous*: the Calf is expreſly called an *Idol* by St. *Stephen*, Acts 7. 41. and the thing is ſo plain that it is denied by none that I know of; ſo here we have a Species of *Idolatry* plainly ſet forth in Scripture, in which the *true God* was worſhipped in an *Image*; and I fancy it is ſcarce neceſſary to inform the Reader, that wherever he finds *LORD* in Capitals in the Engliſh Bible, it is for *Jehovah* in the Hebrew.

11. It is very true that the great and prevailing *Idolatry* of all the *Eaſt* grew to be the Worſhip of the Hoſt of Heaven, which ſeems to have riſen very naturally out of the other *Idolatry* of the *Teraphim*, which probably was the ancienter of the two, for when Men came to think that Divine Influences were tied to ſuch Images, it was very natural for them to fancy that a more ſoveraign degree of Influence was in the Sun, and by conſequence that he deſerved Divine Adoration much more than their poor little *Teraphim*. But it is alſo clear, that this Adoration which they offered to the Sun, was not with relation to the matter of that ſhining Body, but to the Divinity, which they believed was lodged in it. This appears not only

from the Greek Writers, *Zenophon* and *Plutarch*, but from the greateſt Antiquity that is now in the World; the *bas Reliefs* that are in the Ruins of the Temple of *Perſepolis*, which are deſcribed with ſo much Coſt and Care, by that worthy and learned Gentleman Sir *John Chardin*, and which the World expects ſo greedily from him, he favoured me with a ſight of them, and in theſe it appears, that in their Triumphs, of which a whole Series remains intire, they carried not only the Fire, which was the Emblem of the Body of the Sun, but after that the Emblem of the Divinity that it ſeems they thought was in it under the Repreſentation of a *Head environed with Clouds*, which is the moſt natural Emblem that we can fancy, of an Intelligent and Incomprehenſible Being. It's true, as *Idolatry* grows ſtill groſſer and groſſer, the Intelligent Being was at laſt forgot, tho it ſeems it was remembred by their Philoſophers, ſince the Greeks came to know it, and all their Worſhip was paid to the *Sun*, or to his Emblem the Fire, ſo that even this Idolatry was moſt probably the Worſhip of the true God at firſt, under a viſible Repreſentation; and that this was an effect of the former *Idolatry* is confirmed from what was ſaid by *Moſes*, Deut. 4. 14 to 19. where he plainly intimates the Progreſs that *Idolatry* would have, if they once came to worſhip *Graven* or *Molten Images*, or make any ſort of ſimilitude for the great God; this would carry them to lift up their *Eyes to Heaven, and worſhip and ſerve the Hoſt of Heaven.*

12. The next ſhape that Idolatry took, was the worſhipping ſome ſubordinate Spirits their *Genies*, which were in effect *Angels*, or *departed Men and Women*, and this filled both *Greece* and *Rome*, and was the prevailing *Idolatry* when the New Teſtament was writ: But that all theſe Nations believed ſtill one *Supreme God*, and that they conſidered theſe juſt as the *Roman Church* does now *Angels* and *Saints* (*mutatis mutandis*) has been made out ſo invincibly by the Learned Dr. *Stillingfleet*, that one would rather think that he had over-charged his Argument with too much Proof, than that it is any way defective, and yet this Worſhip of thoſe Secondary Deities is charged with *Idolatry* both in the *Acts* and in the *Epiſtles*, ſo often, that it is plain the inſpired Writers believed, that the giving any degrees of Divine Worſhip to a Creature, tho in a ſubor-

ſubordinate form, was *Idolatry*; and St. *Paul* gives us a comprehenſive Notion of *Idolatry*, that it was the giving Divine Service (the word is *Dulia*) to thoſe that by Nature were not Gods, *Gal.* 4. 8. and he throws off all Lords as well as all the Gods of the Heathen as *Idols*, and in oppoſition to theſe, reduces the Worſhip *of the Chriſtians* to the Object of one God the Father, and of one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, 1 *Cor.* 8. 5, 6. So that the *Greek* and *Roman Idolatry* being ſtrictly that which is condemned in the New Teſtament, of which we have ſuch a copious Evidence from their Writings, it is plain that even inferiour degrees of Worſhip, when offered up to Creatures, tho Angels, is *Idolatry*; and tho the Heathens thought neither *Jupiter* nor *Mercury* the ſupreme Deities, yet the Apoſtles did not for all that forbear to call them *Idols*, Acts 14. 15.

13. Our Author pretends to bear a great reſpect to Antiquity, and therefore I might in the next place ſend him to all that the Fathers have writ againſt the *Greek* and *Roman Idolatry*, in which he will find that the Heathens had their Explainers as well as the Church of *Rome* has; they denied they worſhipped their *Images*, but ſaid they made uſe of them only to raiſe up their Minds by thoſe viſible Objects; yet as St. *Paul* begun the Charge againſt the *Athenians* of *Idolatry*, Acts 17. 29. *for their Gods of Gold, Silver, Wood and Stone*, it was ſtill kept up and often repeated by the Fathers, tho the Philoſophers might have thrown it back upon them with all that Pomp of dreadful Words, which our Author makes uſe of againſt thoſe that faſten the ſame Charge upon the Church of *Rome*. The ſame might be ſaid with relation to the Fathers, accuſing them of *Polytheiſm*, in worſhipping many Gods, and of *Idolatry*, in worſhipping thoſe that had been but Men like themſelves: for it is plain that at leaſt all the Philoſophers and wiſe Men believed, that theſe were only deputed by the Great God to govern ſome Countries and Cities; and that they were Mediators and Interceſſors between God and Men; but all this, that appears ſo fully in *Celſus*, *Porphiry*, and many others, did not make the Fathers give over the Charge. Dr. *Stillingfleet* has given ſuch full Proofs of this, that nothing can be made plainer than the matter of Fact is. We know likewiſe that when the Controverſy aroſe concerning the God-head of Jeſus Chriſt, *Athanaſius* and the other *Fathers*, made uſe of the ſame Argument againſt the

Arians, who worshipped him, that they could not be excused from the Sin of *Idolatry*, in worshipping and invocating him whom they believed only to be a Creature; which shews that it was the Sense of the *Christians* of that Age, that all Acts of Divine Worship, and in particular, all Prayers that were offered up to any that was not truly and by Nature God, and the Eternal God, were so many Acts of *Idolatry*. So that upon the whole matter it is clear, that the worshipping the true God under a Corporeal Representation, and the worshipping or invocating of Creatures, tho in an inferior degree, was taxed by the Apostles and by the Primitive Church as *idolatrous*. When they accuse them for those Corruptions of Divine Worship, they did not consider the softning Excuses of more refined Men, so much as the Acts that were done, which to be sure do always carry the stupid vulgar to the grossest degrees of *Idolatry*; and therefore every step towards it is so severely forbid by God, since upon one step made in the publick Worship, the People are sure to make a great many more in their Notions of things, therefore if we should accuse the Church of *Rome* for all the Excesses of the past Ages, or of the more ignorant Notions in the present Age, such as *Spain* and *Portugal*, even this might be in some degree well grounded, because the publick and authoris'd Offices and Practices of that Church has given the rise to all those Disorders; and even in this we should but copy after the *Fathers*, who always represent the *Pagan Idolatry*, not as *Cicero* or *Plutarch* had done it, but according to the grossest Notions and Practices of the vulgar.

14. All that our Author says concerning the *Cherubims*, deserves not an Answer; for what use soever might be made of this, to excuse the *Lutherans* for the use of *Images*, without worshipping them, (tho after all, the doing such a thing upon a Divine Commandment, and the doing it without a Command, are two very different things) yet it cannot belong to the Worship of *Images*, since the *Israelites* paid no worship to the *Cherubims*. They paid indeed a Divine Worship to the *Cloud* of *Glory*, which was between them, and which is often in the Old Testament called *God* himself, in all those Expressions in which he is said to dwell between the Cherubims. But this being a miraculous Symbol of the Divine Presence, from which they had Answers in all extraordinary Cases, it was God himself,

with

with any Image or Repreſentation, that was worſhipped in it; as we Chriſtians pay our Adorations to the Human Nature of Chriſt, by virtue of that more ſublime and ineffable in-dwelling of the *God-head* in him, in which caſe it is God only that we worſhip, in the *Man Chriſt*: even as the Reſpect that we pay to a Man terminates in his Mind, tho the outward Expreſſions of it go to the Body, to which the Mind is united; ſo in that unconceivable Union between the Divine and Human Natures in Chriſt, we adore the God-head only, even when we worſhip the Man.

15. The general part of this Diſcourſe being thus ſtated, the Application of it to the Church of *Rome* will be no hard matter: I will not inſiſt much on the Article of *Image-worſhip*, becauſe it is not comprehended in the *Teſt*, tho our Author dwells longeſt on it, to let us ſee how carefully, but to how little purpoſe he had read Dr. *Spencer*'s learned Book. But if one conſiders the Ceremonies and Prayers with which *Images*, and particularly *Croſſes*, are to be dedicated by the *Roman Pontifical*, and the formal Adoration of the *Croſs* on *Good-friday*; and the ſtrange Virtues that are not only believed to be in ſome Images by the Rabble, but that are authoriz'd not only by the Books of Devotion publickly allowed among them, but even by Papal Bulls and Indulgences, he will be forced to confeſs that the old Notions of the *Teraphim* are clearly revived among them. This could be made out in an infinite Induction of Particulars, of which the Reader will find a large account in the Learned Dr. *Brevint*'s Treatiſe, entituled, *Saul* and *Samuel* at *Endor*. But I come now to the two Branches mentioned in the *Teſt*.

16. One is the Sacrifice of the Maſs; in which if either our Senſes that tell us it is now Bread and Wine, or the New Teſtament in which it is called both Bread, and the Fruit of the Vine, even after the Conſecration; or if the Opinion of the firſt ſeven Centuries, or if the true Principles of Philoſophy, concurring altogether, are ſtrong enough, we are as certain as it is poſſible for us to be of any thing, that they are ſtill according to our Author's own Phraſe, *a ſenſleſs piece of matter*; when therefore this has Divine *Adoration* offered to it, when it is called the *good God*, carried about in ſolemn Proceſſions, and receives as publick and as humble a Veneration as could be offered

offered up to the Deity it self, if it appear'd visibly. Here the highest degree of Divine Worship is offered up to a Creature; nor will such Worshippers, believing this to be truly the Body of Christ, save the matter, if indeed it is not so. This may no doubt go a great way to save themselves, and to bring their Sins into the class of the Sins of Ignorance: but what large Thoughts soever we have of the Mercies of God to their Persons, we can have no Indulgence for an Act of Divine *Adoration*, which is directed to an Object that we are either sure is Bread, or we are sure of nothing else.

17. As for the *Invocation* and *Adoration* of the *Blessed Virgin* and the *Saints*, I shall offer only three Classes of Instances to prove it *Idolatrous*.

1. In the *Office of the Mass* on many of the *Saints Days*, that *Sacrifice* which is no other than the Body and Blood of Christ, according to them is offered up to the Honour of the *Saints*, and they pray to God to accept of it through the Saints Intercession, one would think it were enough to offer up the *Sacrifices* of Prayers and Praises to them; but here is a Sacrifice, which carries in the plain Words of it the most absurd *Idolatry* that is possible, which is the offering up the Creator to the Honour of a Creature.

2. In the Prayers and Hymns that are in their publick Offices, there are Petitions offered up to the Saints, that in the plain sense of the Words import their pardoning our Sins, and changing our Hearts: the daily Prayer to the *Virgin* goes far this way; *Tu nos ab hoste protege, & hora mortis suscipe*; *Do thou protect us from our Enemy, and receive us in the hour of Death.* Another goes yet further; *Culpas nostras ablue, ut perennis Sedem Gloriæ, per te redempti, valeamus scandere*; *Wash thou away our Sins, that so being redeemed by thee, we may ascend up to the Mansions of Glory.* That to the Angels is of the same nature; *Nostra diluant jam Peccata prestando supernam Cœli gloriam*; *May they wash away our Sins, and grant us the Heavenly Glory.* I shall to this add two Addresses to two of our English Saints; the first is to S. *Alban*, *Te nunc petimus Patrone preco sedule, qui es nostra vera Gloria sive precum votis, servorum scelera*; *We implore thee, our Patron, who art our true Glory, do thou take away the Crimes of thy Servants, by thy Prayers.* And the other relates to *Thomas Becket*, whom I believe our Author will not deny to have been

been as great a Rebel, as either *Coligny* or his Faction, and yet they pray thus to Christ, *Tu per Thomæ sanguinem, quem pro te effudit, fac nos Christe, scandere quo Thomas ascendit*; *Do thou, O Christ, make us by the Blood of* Thomas, *which he shed for thee, to ascend up whither he has ascended*: and the Hymn upon him is that Verse of the 8th *Psalm*; *Thou hast crowned him with Glory and Honour, and hast set him over all the Works of thy Hands.* One would think it were no bold thing to pronounce all this and innumerable more Instances which might be brought to the same purpose, to be *idolatrous.* If we are sent by our Author to the sences that may be put on those Words, I shall only say with relation to that that the *Test* condemns the Devotions as they are used in the *Roman Church*; so this belongs to the plain sence of the Words, and if it is confessed that these are *idolatrous*, as ascribing to Creatures the *Right of pardoning Sins*, and of *opening the Kingdom of Heaven*, which are main parts of the Divine Glory, then the matter of the *Test* is justified.

A third sort of Instances is in the Prayer that comes after the Priest has pronounced the Words of Absolution, *Passio Domini nostri* Iesu Christi, *merita* B. Mariæ *Virginis, & omnium Sanctorum, & quicquid benefeceris, vel mali sustinueris, sint tibi in remissionem Peccatorum, augmentum gratiæ & præmium vitæ æternæ: May the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Merits of the B. Virgin, and all the Saints, and all the good thou hast done, or the evil thou hast suffered, be to thee effectual for the remission of thy Sins, the Increase of Grace, and the Reward of eternal Life. Absolution* in its true and unsophisticated meaning, being the Declaration made to a Penitent of the Mercies of God in Christ, according to the Gospel, I would gladly know what milder censure is due to the mixing the Merits of the Virgin and the Saints, with the Passion of Christ, in order to the obtaining this Gospel-pardon, with all the effects of it, than in this of our *Test*, that it is *idolatrous.*

I have now examined the two Points, in which our Author thought fit to make an Apology for the *Church of Rome*, without descending to the particulars of his Plea more minutely. I have used him in this more gently than he deserves; for as I examined his Reasonings, I found all along both so much Ignorance and such gross Disingenuity, that I had some difficulty to restrain my self from flying out on many occasions: but I resolved

to

to purſue theſe two Points, with the gravity of ſtile which the matter required, without entangling the Diſcourſe with ſuch unpleaſant Digreſſions, as the Diſcovery of his Errors might have led me to. And I thought it enough to free unwary Readers from the Miſtakes into which his Book might lead them, without encreaſing the contempt belonging to the Writer, who has now enough upon him; but I pray God grant him Repentance, and a better Mind.

FINIS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Reader is deſired to take notice, that the Author did not know of the Death of the Biſhop of *Oxford*, till this Anſwer was Printed.

244882